

Serial No.: 10/609,471  
Docket No.: 28951.3123/C1

### REMARKS

Claims 11-26 are presented herein including amended claims 11-13, 15, 17, and 19 as well as new claims 21-26.

Applicants believe that this amendment places this application fully in condition for allowance, and surely places it in better condition for any appeal. Accordingly, entry of this amendment and allowance of all claims 11-26 are respectfully requested.

1. Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Maciel et al. U.S. Patent 6,112,248.

Maciel discloses that devices 3a and 3b behave as routers between networks 1 and 2; see Maciel at col. 1, lines 22-23. However, Maciel does not disclose that an appliance connected to a network transmits data only to a predetermined particular router on the network, as claimed by applicants.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Maciel does not disclose all elements of applicants' claimed invention, and therefore is not a proper basis for a §102(b) rejection thereof. Nor is there any disclosure or teaching in Maciel that would have suggested applicants' claimed invention. Thus reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection, and allowance of claim 11 is respectfully requested.

2. Claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Basso et al. U.S. Patent

Serial No.: 10/609,471  
Docket No.: 28951.3123/C1

6,658,481.

Basso discloses data transmission between a pair of systems; see col. 1, lines 31-38. However, Basso does not disclose that when there are a plurality of routers on a network connected to one of the systems, data is transmitted only to a predetermined particular router, as claimed by applicants.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Basso does not disclose all elements of applicants' claimed invention and therefore is not a proper basis for a §102 rejection thereof. Nor is there any disclosure or teaching in Basso that would have suggested applicants' claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in this art. Thus reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection, and allowance of claims 11 and 12 are respectfully requested.

3. Claims 12, 13, 15 and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Balassanian U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0021857.

Balassanian discloses a method and system for routing media from a source resource on a source appliance across a network to a destination resource on a destination appliance. However, Balassanian does not disclose that when there are a plurality of routers on a network connected to one of the systems, data is transmitted only to a predetermined particular router, as claimed by applicants.

Serial No.: 10/609,471  
Docket No.: 28951.3123/C1

For all of the foregoing reasons, Balassanian does not disclose all elements of applicants' claimed invention and therefore is not a proper basis for a §102(e) rejection thereof. Nor is there any disclosure or teaching in Balassanian which would have suggested applicants' claimed invention. Thus reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection, and allowance of claims 12, 13, 15, and 17-20 is respectfully requested.

4. Claims 14 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Balassanian and Teraoka U.S. Patent 6,292,836.

Claims 14 and 16, which depend on claims 13 and 15, respectively, are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 13 and 15.

Teraoka does not disclose what is missing in Balassanian. Teraoka discloses a communications system whereby end points of a TCP connection may be moved between computers in a transparent manner and whereby a TCP connection may be maintained even if a computer in which an end point of the connection resides is relocated on the Internet, but not that when there are a plurality of routers on a network connected to one of the systems, data is transmitted only to a predetermined particular router, as claimed by applicants.

For all of the foregoing reasons, there is no disclosure or teaching in either of Balassanian or Teraoka that would have suggested applicants' claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in this art. Further, there is no disclosure or teaching in either Balassanian or Teraoka that would


Serial No.: 10/609,471  
Docket No.: 28951.3123/C1

have suggested the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' claimed invention. Withdrawal of this rejection of claims 14 and 16 and allowance of the same are therefore respectfully requested.

This application is now fully in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. The PTO is hereby authorized to charge/credit any fee deficiencies or overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-4293 (Order Number 28951.3123/C1). If further changes could put this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 19, 2006

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Roger W. Parkhurst, Reg. No. 25,177  
Tyson Y. Winarski, Reg. No. 41,381

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP  
1330 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036-1795  
Tel: (202) 429-6420  
Fax: (202) 828-3658

RWP/TYW/mnl